International application No.

			2004/015890		
A. CLASSIFIC Int.Cl	CATION OF SUBJECT MATTER H04B3/23, H04M1/60				
According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC					
B. FIELDS SE	EARCHED				
Minimum docum Int.Cl	nentation searched (classification system followed by 6 H04B3/00, H04B7/00, H04M1/00	classification symbols)			
Jitsuvo		oroku Jitsuyo Shinan Koho	1994-2005		
		itsuyo Shinan Toroku Koho	1996–2005		
	pase consulted during the international search (name of	data base and, where practicable, search t	erms used)		
C. DOCUMEN	TS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT				
Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where a	· · ·	Relevant to claim No.		
X A	JP 2002-526961 A (HOUSE EAR 20 August, 2002 (20.08.02), Particularly, Par. No. [0002 Fig. 7 & WO 00/19605 A2 & AU & EP 1118247 A2	,	1,2,4 5-6		
A	JP 10-501951 A (Philips Elect 17 February, 1998 (17.02.98) Particularly, Figs. 2, 4 & WO 96/32776 A2 & KR	,	1,2,4-6		
Special categ	cuments are listed in the continuation of Box C.	See patent family annex.	mational filing date or priority		
"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance "E" earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date "L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified) "O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means "P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the		"Y" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention "X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone "Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art document member of the same patent family			
Date of the actual completion of the international search 17 January, 2005 (17.01.05)		Date of mailing of the international sear 01 February, 2005 (ch report 01.02.05)		
Name and mailing address of the ISA/ Japanese Patent Office		Authorized officer			
Facsimile No. Telephone No. Telephone No. Telephone No.					

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/015890

(Continuation).	DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages Relevant to claim N		
A			1,2,4-6
A	JP 01-198154 A (Oki Electric Industry Co Ltd.), 09 August, 1989 (09.08.89), Particularly, Fig. 5 (Family: none)	• •	1,2,4-6
		į	
	•		·

International application No. PCT/JP2004/015890

Box No. II	Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)
1. Claim	hal search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons: s Nos.: se they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
becaus extent	s Nos.: 3 se they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an that no meaningful international search can be carried out, specifically: xtra sheet)
	s Nos.: se they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).
Box No. III	Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)
·	nal Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:
1. As all claims	required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers all searchable
	searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, this Authority did not invite payment of ditional fee.
3. As onl	y some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers nose claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. No req restrict	quired additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this international search report is ted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:
Remark on Pro	The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest. No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/015890

Continuation of Box No.II-2 of continuation of first sheet(2)

Claim 3 includes describes "calculation of an average value of filter coefficients of a predetermined past period as an offset component" and the Description contains a calculation equation (8).

When these descriptions are considered, for each of the M tap coefficients, the average of the tap coefficients for a predetermined past period is calculated (second term in the right side of equation (8)) and the average is subtracted from the tap coefficient so as to obtain a new tap coefficient.

However, when equation (8) is calculated,

each of the tap coefficient h(k+1, m) at time k+1 is almost 0, for it is apparent that the impulse response of the unknown transmission path to be applied is assumed to be almost invariable for the time from the technical common sense. The low-frequency offset component treated in the invention of the present application does not change largely for the sampling time interval and accordingly, the average value of the past tap coefficients at an arbitrary (m) is considered to be almost identical to the value of the current tap coefficient.

Consequently, when the equation (8) is calculated, all the tap coefficients are set almost to a value of 0. This apparently disturbs the adaptive operation of the filter.

Therefore, by using the operation expressed by claim 3 and equation (8), it is impossible to achieve the effect to be achieved as an echo canceller and it is impossible to rationally understand the technical meaning of the operation. Thus, claim 3 cannot have novelty or inventive step or usability in industry.